



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	36287-02001	2495

27171 7590 10/23/2006

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,403	Applicant(s) MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Pyzocha	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/24/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The rejections under the first and second paragraphs 35 USC 112 have been withdrawn based on the filed amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2137

5. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al (US 6584505) in view of Gupta et al (US 6226752) and further in view of Grandcolas et al (EP 1089516).

As per claims 1, 9-13, 17, and 20, Howard et al discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system (see column 8 lines 52-53); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see column 8 lines 54-56); retrieving, at the first system, information corresponding to a possible session credential for the second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system (see column 6, lines 51-52); the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (see column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

Howard et al fails to disclose the use of session token and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a

Art Unit: 2137

valid session credential with the second system and both the first and that both the first and second system have protected resources.

However, Gupta et al teaches the use of session credentials (see column 11 lines 10-25) and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid credential with the second system and both the first (see column 11 line 39 through column 13 line 40) while Grandcolas et al teaches both the first and second system have protected resources(see page 2 paragraph [0006]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the session token, the inputting and granting of Gupta et al and for both systems to provide protected resources as taught by Grandcolas et al in the system of Howard et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to provide a single sign on solution for the web (see Gupta et al column 6 lines 46-51) and to provide a single sign on user access to multiple web servers (see Grandcolas et al Abstract).

As per claims 2 and 14, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 6).

As per claim 3, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system (see Gupta column 11 line 39 through column 13 line 40).

As per claim 4, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

As per claim 5, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session

Art Unit: 2137

credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

As per claims 6 and 15, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 9, lines 6-14).

As per claim 8, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query (see Howard column 8, lines 8-11).

As per claims 16 and 19, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client (see Howard column 7, lines 12-25).

As per claims 18 and 21, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses granting the client session credentials for the first system (see Howard column 7, lines 54-63).

Art Unit: 2137

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Daddario et al (US 20030040995) and IBM teach methods of single sign on authentication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER